Under the NC, we could never do anything since everything is a shift from the status quo – that’s pretty offensive since even if awful things exist like racism, homophobic or sexist lawsor even genocide we could not alter them. You make debate unsafe since some people who enter this space probably cannot operate under those sorts of assumptions given their personal experiences. The prima facie role of the ballot is to maintain the safety of the debate space – it’s a voting issue since the judge cannot evaluate who is winning under a framework if you exclude others. **TEEHAN:**[[1]](#footnote-1)Honestly, I don't think that 99% of what has been said in this thread so far actually matters. It doesn't matter whether you think that these types of assumptions should be questioned. It doesn't matter what accepting this intuition could potentially do or not do. It doesn't matter if you see fit to make, incredibly trivializing and misplaced I might add, links between this and the Holocaust. **All** of the **arguments that talk about how debate is** a **unique** space for questioning assumptions **make an assumption of safety**. They say that this is a space where one is safe to question assumptions and try new perspectives. **That is not true** for everyone. **When we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism, sexism, homophobia, rape**, lynching, etc., **we make debate unsafe for certain people. The idea that debate is a safe space to question all assumptions is** the definition of **privilege**, it begins with an idea of a debater that can question every assumption. **People who face the actual effects** of the aforementioned things **cannot question those assumptions, and making debate** a space **built around the idea that they can is hostile**. So, you really have a choice. Either 1) say that you do not want these people to debate so that you can let people question the wrongness of everything I listed before, 2) say that you care more about letting debaters question those things than making debate safe for everyone, or 3) make it so that saying things that make debate unsafe has actual repercussions. On "**debate is not the real world**". **Only for people who can separate their existence in "the real world" from their existence in debate.** That means privileged, white, heterosexual males like myself. I don't understand how you can make this sweeping claim when some people are clearly harmed by these arguments. **At the end of the day, you have to figure out whether you care about debate being safe for everyone** involved. I don't think anyone has contested that these arguments make debate unsafe for certain people. If you care at all about the people involved in debate then **don't vote on these arguments**. If you care about the safety and wellbeing of competitors, then don't vote on these arguments. If you don't, then I honestly don't understand why you give up your time to coach and/or judge. The pay can't be that good. I don't believe that you're just in it for the money, which is why I ask you to ask yourselves whether you can justify making debate unsafe for certain people.

Outweighs fairness – you exclude people by not taking account of their speaking position and assuming safety, but there is no prima facie equity in our ability to engage different arguments so it’s a prior question to all-else-considered fairness concerns.

Also takes out your framework since if the GCB is perfect, the existence of massive status quo imperfections like inequality and oppression mean that whoever is in charge is not in fact a good agent.

*framework answers:*

Off GCB exists because we have the idea of it.

1. Perfect being theology fails. God by necessity is outside of the conceptual limits of any human given finitude. Thus, we cannot even make judgments such as our concept is perfect because nothing within our own reason can act as confirmatory data.

2. Both arguments can be restructured to demonstrate absurdity. I can conceive of a scariest possible being, a funniest possible being and a greatest possible island all as easy I conceive of GCB. Thus all would have to be true in feature of things outside myself.

3. Pressupose a univocal concept of greatness which all God’s other qualities fall under, but such a move is arbitrary as would could instead replace greatness with greatness prime which is just like greatness but absence existence. No non-circular reason why Greatness is better than greatness prime.

Off Kreeft.

1. We don’t have an idea of an all-powerful being, perhaps we have an idea of a greatest possible being, because that would require us understanding all possible variations and see GCBs greater than each. At best we have the idea of an infinitely great being, but Cantors degrees of infinite mean we never conceive of anything infinite as the maximally infinite.

2. The idea of a Perfect/infinite being can be a composite concept. A circle has an infinite number of mid-points, and you are a being, so we just combine the infinite property which we experience through seeing a circular table with the qualities you have as an agent.

Off Spinoza

1. Conflates conceptual and ontological levels. Nothing in GCB need prevent them from existing, but something in the idea of GCB, could prevent that idea from being necessary, rendering the argument circular.

More importantly though, even if GBC exists and is the source of ethics, wills are layered and thus GCB may will the world be a certain way, and yet still will we act differently. For example, the GCB could will free will, but it’s beyond us anyway. **LEWIS**[[2]](#footnote-2). Christians, then, believe that an evil power has made himself for the present the Prince of this World. And, of course, that raises problems. Is this state of affairs in accordance with G[CB]'s will or not? If it is, He is a strange God, you will say: and if it is not, how can anything happen contrary to the will of a being with absolute power? But anyone who has been in authority knows how a thing can be in accordance with your will in one way and not in another. It may be quite sensible for a mother to say to the children, "I'm not going to go and make you tidy the schoolroom every night. You've got to learn to keep it tidy on your own." Then she goes up one night and finds the Teddy bear and the ink and the French Grammar all lying in the grate. That is against her will. She would prefer the children to be tidy. But on the other hand, it is her will which has left the children free to be untidy. The same thing arises in any regiment, or trade union, or school. You make a thing voluntary and then half the people do not do it. That is not what you willed, but your will has made it possible.

1. Ryan Teehan [NSD staffer and competitor from the Delbarton School] – NSD Update comment on the student protests at the TOC in 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. C.S. Lewis. *Mere Christianity*. 1944. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)